

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/686,530	10/16/2003	Gerald Duhamel	14296-20US	4008	
31831	7590 09/08/2005		EXAM	INER	
LABTRON	LABTRONIX CONCEPT INC.			PIERCE, WILLIAM M	
•	C/O OGILVY RENAULT 1981 MC GILL COLLEGE AVENUE			PAPER NUMBER	
	SUITE 1600				
MONTREAL, QUEBEC, H3A 2Y3 CANADA			DATE MAILED: 09/08/200	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		SP	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/686,530	DUHAMEL, GERALD	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William M. Pierce	3711	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app iod for Reply	ears on the cover shee	t with the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMU 36(a). In no event, however, ma vill apply and will expire SIX (6) I , cause the application to becom	NICATION. y a reply be timely filed MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
tus			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 Ju	ine 2005		
This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.			
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowar		natters, prosecution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice under E	•	•	
position of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 2-15 and 17-19 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 2-15 and 17-19 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.		
olication Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine		•	
0) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti 1) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex-	·		
•	ammer. Note the attac	ned Office Action of form P10-132.	
prity under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 2) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prioriapplication from the International Bureau 	s have been received. s have been received in ity documents have be	n Application No	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies r	not received.	
chment(s)		WILLIAM M. PIERCE PRIMARY EXAMINED	
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		w Summary (PTO-413)	
_ ` ` `	Paper I		

Art Unit: 3711

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim 17 and its dependent claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In claim 17, the specification does not have support for "a daubed area occupying a position".

Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 18 depends upon canceled claim 1 and "being associated with at least areas" in claim 19 is unclear.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 2, 4-15 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Simunek 5,401,024.

As to claim 2, 4-15 and 17-19 '024 shows receiving a bet (col. 1, ln. 16), providing a card as in fig. 4, selecting designations 32 and randomly selecting these designations to 34 and designating a winner and awarding a prize 40. Where '024 shows marking spots (col. 2, ln. 36) such is done electronically and not manually as "daubing" implies. To have manually provided a card and dauber in order to mark paper cards would have been obvious in order to have a non-electronic game. However, from the scope of claim 4, "daubing" is more consistently defined as any marking means including electronic as anticipated by '024. As to claim 3, '024 shows the number "7" duplicated on the card. More specific to the new limitations in claim 17, '024 shows designating a winner when the daubed area occupies a position at his disclosure of element 54.

Application/Control Number: 10/686,530 Page 3

Art Unit: 3711

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simunek 5,401,024 in view of

Ratzkoff 4,046,382. While '024 fails to duplicate indicia on his card, '382 shows where it is known in the art of bingo

type games to have duplicate indicia on a card.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 6/23/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

No further response to Applicant's arguments is deemed necessary since they amount to a general

allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the

claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing

date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and

the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory

period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication and its merits should be directed to William Pierce at E-mail

address bill.pierce@USPTO.gov or at telephone number (571) 272-4414.

For official fax communications to be officially entered in the application the fax number is (703)

872-9306.

For informal fax communications the fax number is (703) 308-7769.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding can also be directed

to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

Any inquiry concerning the drawings should be directed to the Drafting Division whose telephone

number is (703) 305-8335.

WILLIAM M. PIERCE PRIMARY EXAMINER